

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 5-8, and 10 are pending. In the present amendment, Claims 3, 5-8, and 10 are amended; and Claim 9 is cancelled.

Support for changes to Claim 8 is found in Applicants' Figure 9 and the corresponding written description in the specification, and original Claim 9. The remaining changes to the claims address minor informalities.

The outstanding Official Action rejected Claims 8 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,989,262 to Saito; and allowed Claims 3, 5-7, and 10.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the indication of allowed claims.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Amended Claim 8 is directed to a radio communication terminal that includes, in part, an interference canceller for canceling radiated noise components of electronic equipment from received signals output from a plurality of receivers. The interference canceller includes a plurality of adders each for adding a corresponding one of the plurality of pseudo interference signals to an output of a corresponding one of the plurality of receivers to cancel the radiated noise component in each received signal and to extract an information signal from each received signal. The interference canceller further includes a band converting part that converts the radiated noise directly supplied via a cable from electronic equipment to a same band as a band of the output received signal of the receiver and provides the converted output to a radiated noise predictor.

In a non-limiting example, Applicants' Fig. 9 illustrates information signals (S_{D1} , S_{D2}) being separately extracted from the outputs of plural receivers (211, 212). The outputs of the plural receivers (211, 212) are supplied to plural adders (22A1, 22A2), respectively, where

interference components in the outputs of the receivers are cancelled with plural pseudo interference signals (N_{RE1} , N_{RE2}) to extract information signals (S_{D1} , S_{D2}), respectively.

Turning now to the applied reference, Figure 1 of Saito illustrates a digital modulator having an antenna 1 and a plurality of auxiliary antennas 3-1 to 3-n. The output of antenna 1 is fed to a main intermediate frequency (IF) converter 2, while the outputs of auxiliary antennas 3-1 to 3-n are fed to interference cancellers 10-1 to 10-n. Figure 1 of Saito also illustrates an adder 11 receiving the outputs of the main IF converter 2 and each interference canceller 10-1 to 10-n. In an alternative example, Figure 4 of Saito illustrates a series of cascaded summing amplifiers 11-1 through 11-n, provided respectively for the cancellers 10-1 to 10-n, for canceling interference from sources 30-1 to 30-n.

However, Saito fails to disclose or suggest “a plurality of adders each for adding a corresponding one of said plurality of pseudo interference signals to an output of a corresponding one of said plurality of receivers to cancel said radiated noise component in each received signal and *to extract an information signal from each received signal*” as recited in Claim 8. (Emphasis added). Saito describes that the output signals from the auxiliary antennas are dedicatedly used to generate canceling signals. However, Saito fails to disclose or suggest that the outputs from the auxiliary antennas contain information signals.

Thus, Saito merely describes that the canceling signals generated by the interference cancellers 10-1 to 10-n are all added to a received signal output from a single main IF converter 2. Accordingly, Saito describes using only one receiver (IF converter) to extract an information signal. Since an information signal is not extracted from the output signals from the auxiliary antennas 3-1 to 3-n, Saito fails to disclose or suggest extracting “an information signal from each received signal,” as recited in Claim 8.

Furthermore, the outstanding Official Action identifies the adders 11-1 to 11-n, in the alternative example illustrated in Figure 4 of Saito, as Applicants' claimed "plurality of adders."¹ However, as recited in Claim 8, a corresponding pseudo interference signal is added to a corresponding output of a receiver "to extract an information signal from each received signal." Even though Figure 4 of Saito illustrates a plurality of adders 11-1 to 11-n cascaded sequentially, only a single signal is extracted. Accordingly, the example illustrated in Figure 4 of Saito does not disclose or suggest extracting "an information signal from each received signal."

Claim 8 is further distinguishable over Saito as the applied reference fails to disclose or suggest "a band converting part which converts said radiated noise directly supplied via a cable from said electronic equipment to the same band as that of the output received signal of said receiver." The outstanding Official Action identifies an auxiliary IF converter 5-1 as Applicants' claimed band converter.² Saito describes that the auxiliary IF converter 5-1 receives the output of the antenna 3-1 for translation of a signal to an intermediate frequency.³ However, Saito fails to disclose or suggest that the converter 5-1 is supplied radiated noise directly "via a cable from said electronic equipment," as recited in Claim 8.

Furthermore, as the outstanding Official Action identifies the interference canceller 10-1 as Applicants' claimed electronic equipment, and the auxiliary IF converter 5-1 is included in the interference canceller 10-1, the auxiliary IF converter 5-1 cannot receive radiated noise directly from the interference canceller 10-1.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Saito fails to disclose or suggest all the features of Claim 8. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

¹ See Official Action of July 3, 2007 at page 3.

² See Official Action of July 3, 2007 at page 3.


³ See Saito at column 3, lines 30-32.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claims 3, 5-8, and 10, and claims depending therefrom, are allowable.

Consequently, in view of the present response, no further issues are believed to be outstanding in the present application, and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Zachary S. Stern
Registration No. 54,719